

REMARKS

Claims 5 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Seidensticker, Jr. et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,128,012) in view of Ahlberg et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,758,295).

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Uchida (U.S. Pat. No. 6,161,026) in view of Cushman et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,125,287) and further in view of Ahlberg et al..

It is gratefully acknowledged that independent Claims 6-9 remain allowed.

Claims 1-2 and 4-11 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 5-9 being independent claims, and Claim 3 being canceled.

Claims 1 and 5 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Uchida in view of Cushman et al. and further in view of Ahlberg et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method comprising the steps of detecting whether a user has input a single scroll key corresponding to a menu, *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in one of a left-right direction and a downward-upward direction, and being any one key of alphanumeric keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal.*

Uchida discloses a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method relying on a single dedicated key 10 (FIG. 1, col. 3 lines 49-57). Uchida hints nowhere that the dedicated key 10 is any one key of alphanumeric keys. The Examiner also stipulates in the Office Action on page 6 lines 3-4 that Uchida does not disclose “the key being any one of a plurality of keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal.” Uchida fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in one of a left-right direction and a downward-upward direction, and being any one key of alphanumeric keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal*

taught by Amended Claim 1.

Cushman et al. discloses a wireless telephone having an improved user interface, the telephone using a dedicated “OPTions” key for menu scrolling by activating the OPTions key “to change the current function assignments for the arrow keys” (FIG.1, col. 3 lines 10-27). Cushman et al., like Uchida, hints nowhere the dedicated “OPTions” key being any one key of alphanumeric keys. Further, for menu scrolling, Cushman et al. requires the operation of a combination of both the “OPTions” key and at least one of the “four function keys in the shape of up, down, left and right arrows” (FIG. 1, col. 2 lines 62-63). By contrast, for menu scrolling, the present application requires solely one single scroll key being any one key of alphanumeric keys. Cushman et al., as well as Uchida, fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in one of a left-right direction and a downward-upward direction, and being any one key of alphanumeric keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal* taught by Amended Claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Uchida.

Ahlberg et al. discloses a sole crosspoint 4-way scroll key 114 for menu scrolling (Fig. 2A). In the Office Action, the Examiner alleges that the scroll key 114 of Ahlberg et al. is one of the keys 111 (alphanumeric keys) and keys 112 (functional keys), citing Fig. 2A and col. 9 line 65 – col. 10 line 16 of Ahlberg et al. Applicants respectfully traverse the allegation. Fig. 2A of Ahlberg et al. explicitly shows the scroll key 114 as a dedicated key. Ahlberg et al. asserts in col. 9 line 65 – col. 10 line 16 that “the navigation key may be a cross-arrow key having four sides” (col. 10 lines 6-7), i.e. the dedicated scroll key 114 shown in Fig. 2A; or “[a]lternatively, four arrow keys pointing in respective upward, downward, and sideward directions” (col. 10 lines 9-11); or further alternatively, a dedicated single key having two arrows upward and downward (Figs. 3C and 3D). Ahlberg et al. hints nowhere a scroll key being any one of alphanumeric keys. Ahlberg et al., as well as Uchida, fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in one of a left-right direction and a downward-upward direction, and being any one key of alphanumeric keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal* taught by Amended Claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Uchida.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Uchida, Cushman et al., Ahlberg et al., or any combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Seidensticker, Jr. et al. in view of Ahlberg et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 5 teaches, in part, a key input method for diversifying key functions in a mobile telecommunication terminal, the method comprising detecting whether a user has set a scroll function when displaying a menu screen; if so, detecting whether an input state of a single scroll key set for a scroll function is maintained for a predetermined period of time, *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key of alphanumeric keys.*

Seidensticker, Jr. et al. discloses a key input method for menu scrolling, the method relying on a keypad 36 comprising four scroll keys 38, 40, 42 and 44 for scrolling directions (FIGs. 1-2 and 8; col. 5 lines 7-20; col. 9 line 63 through col. 10 line 17; col. 12 line 63 through col. 13 line 41). By contrast, Amended Claim 5 of the present application claims *a single scroll key* for scrolling. The Examiner also conceded in the Office Action at page 4 lines 5-6 that Seidensticker, Jr. et al. fails to disclose a “single scroll key for menu scrolling.” Seidensticker, Jr. et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in left, right, upward and downward directions, the single scroll key being any one key of alphanumeric keys* taught by Amended Claim 5.

With respect to Ahlberg et al., the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 5. Ahlberg et al., as well as Seidensticker, Jr. et al., fails to disclose the limitation of *the single scroll key for menu scrolling in one of a left-right direction and a downward-upward direction, and being any one key of alphanumeric keys provided on the mobile telecommunication terminal* taught by Amended Claim 5, and thus fails to cure the defects of Seidensticker, Jr. et al.

Clearly, Amended Claim 5 structurally differs from Seidensticker, Jr. et al., Ahlberg et al., or the combination thereof.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-2 and 4-11, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicants' attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paul J. Farrell", written in a cursive style.

Paul J. Farrell
Reg. No. 33,494
Attorney for Applicants

The Farrell Law Firm
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard Suite 701
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel 516-228-3565
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/fl